## UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No.	05-6004	

KELVIN J. MILES,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

WARDEN, MARYLAND CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION - HAGERSTOWN,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Greenbelt. Alexander Williams, Jr., District Judge. (CA-04-3660-AW)

Submitted: March 25, 2005 Decided: April 18, 2005

Before LUTTIG, MICHAEL, and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Kelvin J. Miles, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

## PER CURIAM:

Kelvin J. Miles, a state prisoner, seeks to appeal the district court's orders denying relief on his petition filed under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2000) and denying his motion for reconsideration. An appeal may not be taken from the final order in a § 2254 proceeding unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1) (2000). A certificate of appealability will not issue for claims addressed by a district court absent "a substantial showing of the denial of constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2) (2000). A prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find both that the district court's assessment of his constitutional claims is debatable or and wrong that dispositive procedural rulings by the district court are also debatable or wrong. See Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 338 (2003); <u>Slack v. McDaniel</u>, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); <u>Rose v. Lee</u>, 252 F.3d 676, 683 (4th Cir. 2001). We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Miles has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. The motion for bail and appointment of counsel is denied. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process. motion to expedite consideration of this appeal is denied as moot.